THE JOURNAL

OF EDUCATIONAL

SOCIOLOGY

OCTOBER 1953

TEACHER-TRAINING IN SPAIN*

William H. Grayson, Jr.

The Teacher-Training Program of Spain is conducted through institutions called Escuelas del Magisterio (also called Escuelas Normales del Estado).[1] These schools have been established by the State and are located in each of the thirteen provinces which comprise the political organization of the country. The school in Barcelona serves the Province of Catalonia and has four hundred girl students; the one in Madrid, serving Castilla, la Vieja, has three hundred students.[1a] In each province, there are also Religious Training Schools for Teachers set up by the Bishop of the Diocese, and private schools conducted by licensed individuals for the same purpose. The students of this latter type of teacher-training are called "libres" (free) because they are not a part of the State schools and do most of their work at home under the guidance and supervision of the *licenciados* who direct these private schools. Both religious and private schools are free and independent of government control. However, the pro-

---

*After spending six weeks in Europe with the New York University Workshop in Contemporary Europe and Public Education, summer of 1953, the writer spent a month studying the Teacher Education Program in operation throughout the thirteen provinces of Spain. The information and materials used in this article were gathered through personal contact with persons working with the National Program of Education: an Inspector of Primary Training at the Ministry of National Education, Madrid; the editors of *Escuela Espanola*, Mayor, 4, Madrid, and of *El Magisterio Espanol*, San Jeronimo, 17, Madrid; and officials of La Escuela Normal, Rambla Cataluna, 123, Barcelona, and La Escuela Normal, Santisima Trinidad, 37, Madrid. Contact and communication were in Spanish and the writer's wife acted as interpreter.

[1] Laws governing the establishment of Schools of Teacher-Training appear in *Ley de Educación Primaria*, de 17 de julio de 1945, Texto Legal, Direccion General de Enseñanza Primaria, Servicio de Publicaciones del Ministerio de Educacion Nacional, Madrid, 1952: pages 73-87.

[1a] Both of these schools were visited and their officials interviewed.

gram of studies in all of these schools must be in accordance with
the standards set up by the State and printed in a small brochure of
ninety pages.[2] In this brochure are contained the topics to be covered
in the questions of the Entrance Examination to the Normal School;
Topics of Course Content; Rules of Guidance for the student and
Topics for Questions for the Final Examinations. These are avail-
able to instructors and to all students aspiring to become licensed
teachers. This is the guide to the program of their studies.

The National Teacher-Training Program is divided into two sec-
tions: one for the training of men teachers, and the other for the
training of women.) There is an abundance of women students and
a scarcity of men in most provinces. In industrial areas, enrollment
of men is even smaller than in others.) There is a further division of
the Teacher-Training Program for the preparation of teachers for
schools of four categories. According to the Office of the Ministry of
National Education, Spanish schools are of certain designated types
which fall under four periods:

first,   The period of initiating children into the school
          a. *Escuelas Maternales* (for children from three to four
              years of age)
          b. *Escuelas de Parvulos* (for children from four to six
              years of age)

second,   The period of elementary training for those from six to
          ten years of age

third,   The period of Advancement (The Spanish word is per-
          feccionamiento) for those from ten to twelve.

Children are required to attend school until they are twelve, then,
there are

fourth,   Schools for those who wish and can take further training
          a. *Preparatorias* for those who wish to become Bachil-
              lers
          b. *Incipiantes Professionales* for those children from
              twelve to fifteen who wish to begin studying for
              professions.

---

[2]*Estudios del Magisterio*, Editorial *Escuela Espanola*, Hijos de Ezequiel Solana,
Mayor, 4, Madrid. A corollary to this brochure is a new publication, *Cuestion-
arios Nacionales para la Ensenanza Primaria*, published under the Direccion
General de Ensenanza Primaria del Ministerio de Educacion Nacional, Madrid,
1953. This contains outlines of content and methods of teaching children in
the Escuelas Primarias where children from six to twelve attend.

Students in the Teacher-Training Program do their practice in all of the first three types of schools. (The sexes start attending school together at three years of age, and are separated in the *Escuelas Primaries,* remaining separate through Teacher-Training. They come together in the Universities and special career schools.)

Students entering State Normal Schools are eligible to take the Entrance Examination only after completing four years of Bachillerato. After meeting Entrance Requirements, they take a three year prescribed course. This has certain constants for the entire three year period: Religion; Physical Education; Observation and Practice Teaching; Political Social Organization and Homemaking. For two years, the constants are Music; Handicraft (or Manual Training); Writing; Drawing; Pedagogy; Philosophy; Mathematics; Geography and History. There is one year of French; Physiology; Hygiene and Natural History. All classes are conducted through the lecture method.

Practice-teaching is conducted in an Observation-Demonstration School which is annexed to the Normal School. (The "libres" are required to do their student teaching in public schools arranged for by the "licenciado" who instructs them, or by the school they attend. If "officiales", or students of the Escuelas del Magisterio, can not be fitted into the Annexed Demonstration School for practice-teaching, use is made of the public school classes, so that every student may meet the requirements of hours. There have been cases of girls doing their practice-teaching in their own home-towns.) Observation, participation and practice teaching are distributed over the three-year period. During the first year, students, in groups of ten, spend an aggregate of fifteen full days in observing only. Also, one of the demonstration teachers comes periodically to the Normal School to evaluate the previous observations with the students. She makes sure that they become acquainted with the school building; the classrooms; the teaching materials;[3] the school subjects; the grades of classes; schedules; general methodology; the children and the teachers. Each student-teacher must write descriptions of her observations in a *Memoria* (log), and submit this to the Office, from

---

[3]Among the teaching aids are two periodicals, authorized by the Ministry of National Education: *Escuela Espanola*, a weekly, which prints Official Bulletins and Declarations of the Ministry of Education; Lists of vacancies in schools and of eligible teachers; curriculum topics, lesson plans, etc., and *El Magisterio Espanol*, which contains articles on school topics and activities of the Ministry of Education. This is a monthly paper. Editors of both of these publications were interviewed.

where the observed teacher and the Inspector of Teacher-Training get them in order to acquaint themselves with the students' reactions to what they have seen in the demonstration school.

In the second year of their training, students begin to participate gradually in some of the activities of the classrooms, spending an aggregate of twenty days in the Observation-Demonstration School. In addition, as in the previous year, the demonstration teacher comes periodically to discuss and evaluate their increasing participation in classroom activities.

In Spain, specialists are not developed, but every teacher is trained to work in specialized fields. During the second year of teacher-training, the demonstration teacher instructs the student-teachers in Lesson Planning, first in general planning,—and then for some of the special situations in which they may find themselves after graduation, such as: a one-room school; the school or "parvulos" (ages four to six); the class of physically handicapped; children of superior intellect, etc.[4] Each student keeps a Memoria of the second year experiences in the Demonstration School and submits the same to the Normal School office.

The third and final year of the Teacher-Training Program, the student spends an aggregate of a month or more of full days in actual teaching. As in the previous years, the students have periodic sessions with the demonstration teacher who acquaints them with the resources which are available to the teacher. Of special interest are the "Colonias Escolares" (school camps), which are complementary institutions of the school, established to benefit children of weak health and poor social and economic conditions. Young teachers are chosen to man these camps so as to make them a continuation of the work of the school. In preparation for positions in such camps, selected student-teachers are sent to be trained there as part of their teacher-training practice work.[5]

The third year, the student-teachers make a Memoria of lesson plans for the classes they teach. The Memoria, one for each year, must be submitted to the Office of the *Escuela del Magisterio* before the students are eligible to take the final examination.

---

[4]The officials of the Escuelas del Magisterio who were interviewed feel that building specialized skills within a general program is more effective than developing such skills in a specialized program.

[5]These camps are for children from eight to fourteen, and are supported by the city and state. They are placed in the suburbs of large cities; in the mountains, and near the sea. Each graded school of several classes is required to organize its own colony or camp.

At the completion of the three year Teacher-Training Program, a final examination is given, consisting of three parts: a written review; an oral examination, and a demonstration of the student's ability to teach a class in one of the several curriculum areas. This examination is prepared and conducted by the Office of the Director of the State Normal School in each province. It must be taken by every student from all the schools preparing teachers who aspire for licenses. Following the rating of the outcome, an official list of all the students in each province who have qualified as potential teachers is published. Persons are taken from this list as the need for their employment arises.

There are Inspectors of Teacher-Training, working out of the Office of the Ministry of Education, who supervise Practice-teaching done in Teacher-training institutions throughout Spain. They are the link between the Methods Courses taught in the Teacher-Training Schools and the Practice-Teaching Programs. It is he, for men, and she, for women, who, being well acquainted with many schools in their Districts, can after seeing a student teach, point out to her the adequacy of her approach or the need for the improvement of certain devices and skills. After a practice-teaching lesson, the demonstration teacher and the inspector sit down with the student and together they compare notes. The inspector is the highest authority in the whole practice-teaching program.

From information given at the Ministry of Education in Madrid, it appears that the national system of education in Spain is in a period of transition from a de-centralized to centralized organization. Among other changes, it is hoped to make available to as many prospective teachers as possible practice experience of three days a week throughout the second and third years of their Teacher-Training. When this plan is put into operation, students will practice the entire morning, or the entire afternoon. Also, plans are being considered for specialization in teacher-training, involving the establishment of special schools in which teachers can be trained to work with children of special ages, such as, those in the *Escuelas Maternales* and *Escuelas de Parvulos* (children from three to six years of age), or to work with children of special capacities or handicaps.

William H. Grayson Jr. is with the Department of Education, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York.

SOCIOLOGY STUDY AS AN AID TO TEACHERS

Harry R. Doby and Philip M. Smith

In what ways is the study of *sociology* helpful to future teachers? As usually offered in the colleges of education, is it largely a hodge-podge of loosely related topics of questionable value? Or is it an essential discipline with a firmly established reputation for useful-ness in the teaching profession? Certainly, there is abundant evi-dence that the latter is the case. Information obtained from many teachers in service suggests that no other area of study is of more value than sociology from the standpoint of understanding *human relations*.

In the teachers colleges it is customary to think in terms of *edu-cational sociology*,[1] which may be defined roughly as "the application of sociology to education." The basic courses, ordinarily, are "intro-ductory sociology" and "social problems," or their equivalent. Com-paratively few courses now carry "educational sociology" labels. To get a true picture of the situation, it is necessary to broaden the scope of our definition so as to include all elements primarily of a socio-logical nature which have a direct bearing on the educative process. What seems significant, in this connection, is that "education" courses are steadily increasing their "sociological" content, while shifting their emphasis from the study of individual differences as such to the effects of the social environment upon children as a factor in these differences.

As those who are dedicated to the task of "molding the minds of youth," our teachers need more than a superficial understanding of the social order in which the school plays so significant a part. Such knowledge is arrived at in primitive societies through direct ob-servation and participation within a range of experience so limited in scope that formal study is not required. But in a dynamic and complex society such as ours, "common sense" judgments, based on superficial observations, chance impressions, and hearsay evidence, are practically worthless for interpreting what is going on behind

---

[1]For an excellent review of offerings in the field, see George S. Herrington, "An Analysis of Courses in Educational Sociology with Proposed Changes," *"The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 22:259-275, (December 1948). Cf. W. B. Brookover, "Sociology of Education: A Definition," *American Sociological Review*, 14: 407-415 (June 1949). For background information, consult selected writings of E. George Payne, F. J. Brown, W. R. Smith, D. Snedden, C. A. Ellwood, G. S. Counts, W. H. Kilpatrick, and John Dewey.

the scenes. The study of sociology, as the science of society, can help the teacher to make more accurate appraisals of social phenomena than might otherwise be the case.

If education is the "cornerstone of democracy," it would indeed be folly for teachers to ignore its social implications. What *kind* of education is to be offered in our public schools? Certainly, there is a definite place for the "3 R's," for vocational subjects, for the natural sciences, for the humanities, and for the fine arts. But, in our muddled world today, man needs, more than anything else perhaps, to learn to get along with his fellows. The frank realization of this fact, on the part of educators, helps to explain the current emphasis on the value of the *social studies,* despite the insidious attacks of certain vested interests on this phase of the school program, especially as it relates to "progressive" education.

Many students are confused in their thinking about social issues by reason of the barrage of propaganda to which they are exposed through the mass media of communication. A major source of the difficulty is that professional propagandists often popularize "common sense" conclusions about social phenomena with the deliberate intention of misleading the public. Unless he learns to discriminate regarding his sources of information, the mentally immature student may therefore turn out to be a "social illiterate" as an adult. Since no truly intelligent thinking can take place until the facts are at hand, he needs to study propaganda analysis as a means of separating truth from falsehood, whether it be in relation to advertising, economics, or politics. The alert, well-informed teacher with a strong background in sociology and related subjects can do much to help him with his investigations.

In a classroom devoted to the "objective" study of social problems, do we not find an excellent milieu for the cultivation of democratic ideas? This, of course, may call for free and open discussion of controversial topics, including conflicting political, social, and economic philosophies, at the high school level. Although some of the more cautious educators deem such activities "unwise" and inexpedient, is not the discussion of debatable issues the very essence of democracy, as in the old New England town meeting? Should the ultimate decision at the bar of public opinion go against that which now exists, do we not need the courage to attempt something new and *better* whenever that which is old fails to meet our changing needs? Certainly, it is the genius of democracy that we are ever willing to *experiment,* so long as this experimentation is conducted within the framework of our democratic institutions. This approach stems from

a belief in progress, from a conviction that our world can become a better place to live in through the exercise of the creative intelligence of all peoples. Through the medium of thorough study and discussion of social problems, under the wise guidance of stimulating teachers, students can become better prepared to make their own decisions as to what solutions seem most likely to strengthen our democratic way of life.

Many teachers are impatient with colleagues who assume an air of detached objectivity concerning social issues, which is often unrealistic, irresponsible, and even hypocritical. In a period of history marked by the widespread dissemination of undemocratic and irreligious myths, such as that of the "master race," for example, knowledge of the facts is not enough. There is a strong conviction among progressive educators that students should know something of the techniques of social action programs so as to help offset the injustices perpetrated by those who discriminate against minority groups. But if their teachers seem indifferent toward issues which are of vital importance in a democracy, what should we expect of the students who are looking for someone to lead them?

From the study of sociology we learn that the school is one of our basic social institutions. As such, it cannot function in a social vacuum, for it is part and parcel of the society that gave it birth. If there is lack of equality of educational opportunity in our nation, if there are vicious and unfounded attacks upon the loyalty and integrity of our teachers, and if there is unfair criticism of "progressive" education by some who know least about its nature and objectives, would this not seem to reveal a prevailing atmosphere of injustice and intolerance which is foreign to the true spirit of American institutions? To insist that teachers and students should remain aloof from such controversies may be to miss the point entirely. For the outcome is a matter of deep concern to all who have the true interests of education at heart.

One of the important areas of study in which sociology has made a distinctive contribution to teacher training in recent years is that of *community survey-analysis*. There is a widespread conviction, both among college administrators and school board members, that teachers should be familiar with the nature, resources, and needs of the communities where they live and work. Those who *know* their communities best are usually in a better position to enlist the cooperation of the townspeople in their respective school programs. From an educational standpoint, the closer the school is to the community sociologically the greater is its opportunity for rendering ef-

ficient service to the constituency. Students participating in surveys are often amazed to discover how little they actually knew about their home communities on the basis of surface impressions. Then, too, the contacts made in such investigations are often helpful in school work, while the findings may disclose the need for community action in relation to such matters as public health, traffic safety, recreation, delinquency prevention, and so on.

Interested in learning the views of Michigan public school teachers regarding the values they derived from the study of sociology, the writers have been compiling and analyzing both oral and written statements included in a cumulative sample over a period of years. Since a questionnaire form was not used to limit the scope of the replies, the respondents exhibited a wider range of choices in their answers to the general question than would otherwise have been the case. They were given an opportunity, however, to mention specific courses that helped them, in the order of their relative importance, and to give the reasons for their selections. Analysis of the results yielded some interesting information.

The replies were subsumed under five general headings, largely for reasons of convenience since there was considerable overlapping. These categories were: (1) Knowledge of Social Background Phenomena; (2) Understanding of Children's Attitudes and Behavior; (3) Social Adjustment of the Teacher; (4) Understanding of Social Problems; and (5) Training for Citizenship in a Democracy. Typical answers reproduced below will serve to illustrate the foregoing.

Knowledge of Social Background Phenomena. "Sociology study shows the teacher how to get background information about the community." "Helps us to understand social class differences in the community." "Shows us the importance of knowing the social backgrounds of our pupils." "Knowledge of varying family types aids teachers in understanding their students." "Explains why we can't understand the problem child unless we are familiar with his home environment." "Shows us that people have different ways of doing things, depending on their cultural level." "Teaches us that children's behavior patterns are closely related to type of family and neighborhood." "Points out the importance of poverty and slums in relation to school problems." "Emphasizes the value of community surveys as an aid to the teacher." "Reveals how race, religion, or nationality backgrounds of the families involved can affect the school situation."

Understanding of Children's Attitudes and Behavior. "Sociology stressed the importance of learning *why* a child is not getting along well in school, of discovering the social factors affecting his attitudes." "It made me more eager to help the child from a broken home who is discouraged." "It taught me never to scold a child before the other children because of his need to

retain social status." "When I found that some of my children came to school without breakfast, I began to understand the reasons for their attitudes in class." "I can appreciate what it means for a child from a home that is really no home at all to receive a few kind words of encouragement and praise." "It helped me to see why a new boy in my room from the South seemed such a bully; he felt he was being picked on as a 'hillbilly'." "I learned that children who misbehave are often only imitating their elders and that this makes them feel grown-up at times." "I found that most children are eager to achieve status in their peer group, and that they need something to do which will bring social recognition." "Sociology study helped me to understand how a child's personality is molded by his associates."

Social Adjustment of the Teacher. "My studies helped me to see why the teacher must be well adjusted to her school and community to do a good job." "I can now understand the unfavorable effects of maladjusted teachers on their pupils from a sociological standpoint." "Because I think of my pupils as the product of their social environment, I am more sympathetic and understanding and better adjusted as a teacher on that account." "By getting to know the parents of some of my problem children, and observing their home situations, I find that teaching becomes more meaningful and worthwhile." "It wasn't easy for me to start teaching in a room where some of the children were dirty and indifferent; but when I learned they were from rural slums, I knew I had a challenge to meet." "The study of group behavior was of value in giving me an insight into problems of motivation, so that I know how to get along with my fellow teachers as well as with my students."

Understanding of Social Problems. "My sociology courses taught me that social problems are matters of deep concern to school people." "I learned that it is the teacher's duty to observe children closely for symptoms of juvenile delinquency." "I came to the conclusion that racial prejudice and discrimination are evils that children should know about and which the schools should combat through educational programs." "It was shocking for me to find, in a research assignment, that so many schools for Negro children are far inferior to those for whites." "I had no idea previously to what extent there is inequality of educational opportunity in our country." "Knowing more about the problem of divorce has helped me to gain perspective regarding broken families in my community." "I can now see the value of family life education in high schools, including a unit dealing with questions about sex." "From my studies I think I can understand better why boys who come from poor homes, and who truant from school, are more likely to become criminals." "I was much surprised to learn that more isn't being done to improve our prisons and our mental institutions." "There is a question for which I found no satisfactory answer: 'How can education help to stop wars'?' "

Training for Citizenship in a Democracy. "It was my impression that class discussion of social problems was good training for responsible citizenship." "Freedom of speech in the classroom was something I appreciated

as part of the American way of life." "Learning how to detect and analyze propaganda proved a profitable experience." "I was told that the schools are democracy's 'first line of defense'; if so, what puzzles me now is why we can't raise enough money to give our children a better deal." "I decided from my studies that the best way to preach democracy is to practise it." "By giving our youth more social responsibility we help them to become good citizens." "The study of sociolgy enabled me to see the powerful effects of the movies, radio, television, and comics upon our people." "I learned that a responsible citizen should study the causes of our social problems and try to help remove them." "From what I studied, I became convinced that it is the duty of the schools to offer more citizenship training through an action program involving direct participation."

Doubtless, some of the more enthusiastic respondents tended to overestimate the practical value of sociological knowledge in their respective school situations. Others probably confused things they learned in sociology classes with information acquired from studies in related fields. What seemed significant, however, was their eagerness to stress the value of a better understanding of *human relations* in teaching and to mention topics which, in some respects, are primarily sociological.[2]

Analysis of the data was perhaps more interesting than specifically enlightening. Subject matter areas were summarized in terms of frequency of mention, as well as order of preference, and then expressed in percentages. Because of obvious overlapping, no clear-cut line of demarcation could be drawn in many instances. Nevertheless, a definite trend was discernible. Problems of the School and Community ranked first in order of importance (76 per cent); Juvenile Delinquency ranked second (69 per cent); Problems of Intergroup Relations (or Minority Group Problems) was third (65 per cent); Problems of the Family (or Family Life Education) was fourth (60 per cent); and Propaganda Analysis (or Public Opinion and Propaganda) ranked fifth (53 per cent). Certain of the respondents rated two or more of the above as being equally valuable to the teacher. Almost without exception, those replying tended to appraise general sociology courses, which should be indispensable for an understanding of social processes and social institutions, in terms of their value for helping with specific "problem" areas of study.

---

[2]Cf. Dan W. Dodson, "Human Relations in Teacher Training," *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 22: 106-115, (October 1948).

Harry R. Doby is Assistant Professor of Sociology and Philip M. Smith is Professor of Sociology at Central Michigan College of Education, Mt. Pleasant.

A FORMULA FOR THE PROCESS OF SOCIALIZATION

T. R. Schaffler

A child possesses no human nature at birth. At this time he is only a raw homo sapien with human nature potentials, and as R. G. Smith puts it, "You came into the world a polymorphous perverse little ape with a billion years of biological evolution precipitated, so to speak, in your dimpled organism. You came naked, without shame, without language, food habits, or manual dexterity; ideas or religious faith; without respect for law and order and with no discernable admiration for Mr. Hoover. You came with no higher desires than to have your capacious belly filled with milk and your somatic and visceral itches scratched by loving hands."[1]

Today it is common knowledge that at birth the chid has no personality pattern, but the pattern of personality possessed by any fifteen year adolescent is the net product of the interaction and integration of the various factors set forth in the formula above.

As the new born babe enters the physical and social world there are some well defined and definite response patterns already set up in his organism. These are automatic behavior stimulus-response mechanisms ready by nature to serve and save him. On the other hand many other response patterns which will be developed later are not so well defined at birth, and may be thought of as dynamic forces ready to react in a number of directions, depending upon the stimulus situation experienced.

"Biological heredity," say Ogburn and Nimkoff, "ushers the infant actor onto the stage which physical environment, the group and culture have set. The dramatic action now begins, and the new born babe is gradually transformed into a social person. The term used by the sociologist to designate this transformation is socialization."[2]

When we analyze the new born actor we find that he possesses a number of organic powers or traits making up what is called the O. H. factor (organic heritage) or sometimes it is known as the Original Nature or Original Endowment. These dynamic powers or forces make up his "quiver of arrows" or "stock in trade," so to

---

[1]R. G. Smith, "The Noble Animal," *Fugitive Papers*, quoted in John F. Cuber, *Sociology, A Synopsis of Principles*, D. Appleton Century, New York, p. 155.

[2]William F. Ogburn and Meyer F. Nimkoff, *Sociology*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1950, p. 193.

A FORMULA FOR THE PROCESS OF SOCIALIZATION

$$[\text{O.H.} \times (\text{C.H.,} + \text{S.G.})] \, \text{U.E.} = \text{T.S.P. or H.N.}^x$$

Organic Heritage	Cultural Heritage	Social Groups	Unique Experiences	Tentative Social Personality or Human Nature
Reflexes	Folkways	Family	Comfort-discomfort	Normal:
Endocrine System	Mores	Play Group	Success-failure	extrovert
Autonomic Nervous	Taboos	School	Pleasure-pain	introvert
System	Customs	Church	Positive status-	ambivert
Central Nervous System	Beliefs	Clubs	negative status	
Drives	Language	Work Groups	Encouragement-	Abnormal:
Temperament	Institutions	Community	inhibition	spoiled child
Capacities	Technicways			delinquent youth
	Culture Objects			unsocial adult
Continuing factor	Continuing factors	Continuing factors	Unique Conditioning factor	

speak with which to begin his fateful excursion or voyage upon the unknown "sea of life."[3]

The most highly developed trait in this organic heritage is the reflex, consisting of a stimulus-response arc made up of the familiar affector-connector-effector sequence. In other words, when confronted by certain stimuli regular behaviorisms like breathing, sucking, swallowing, sneezing, vomiting, et cetera, naturally follow. These, can of course be conditioned, but need no learning to act.

In this O. H. factor we note also the endocrine system consisting of the ductless glands located in various parts of the body, all having a function to perform in the proper maturation and growth of the organism. The hormones produced by these glands are believed to also play a most important effective part in bringing to the emerging personality balance and poise. There is also present, and functioning, at birth the autonomic nervous system which may be compared to the "thermostat" of the body, registering various physical and emotional disequilibriums, and at the same time directing certain reflexive mechanisms which, with the aid of the endocrine system, prepare the organism for regaining equilibrium.

The central nervous system, consisting of the brain, the spinal cord and the nerves reaching out through the body, resembles potentially a blank sheet or tablet upon which the other factors (the C. H. and S. G.) through the technique of experience begin immediately to write impressions.

Likewise in the organism we find certain crude drives, urges to action, brought into play by physical imbalance, which propel the organism toward certain types of behavior. While the number of these drives (once called instincts), vary with the student of behavior, ranging from one fundamental force (sex) to more than fifty, there are at least four rather well defined such drives.[4] The hunger drive which also includes thirst or the want of oxygen, is stimulated by the organic imbalance brought on by a negative metabolic rate producing a state of disequilibrium. The child's body (wonderfully made) endeavors, through this drive, to correct this imbalance, by seeking food and drink or air. Two other drives present at birth and ready to sustain the life of the organism are the urges to fight or flight depending upon the circumstances surrounding the stimulation, or the character of the imbalance created within the

---

[3]Lawrence Guy Brown, *Social Pathology*, F. S. Crofts and Company, New York, 1942, Chapter 2.

[4]Francis Brown, *Educational Sociology*, Prentice Hall Company, New York, 1947, p. 12.

organism. The sex drive is also present, potentially, at birth, but matures later, however, much earlier than the age of pubescence.

Temperament is the questionable trait in the O. H. factor. Temperament is here defined as the typical emotional disposition of the organism or babe. Whether it is present at birth or is a product of socialization is debatable. The old theories of one's temperament being determined by astronomical or astrological influence or by the birth experience of the infant have been declared obsolete, and even the old classic categories of Choleric, Sanguine, Phlegmatic, and Melancholic are seldom used in modern treatises on the subject.

A more modern theory of temperament held by a number of sociologists is that temperament is not an emotional die cast upon the newborn by the stars or by the fate of birth, but rather it is the complex residual feeling tone resulting from drive experiences as they have been registered, integrated and blended by the autonomic nervous system and the endocrine system of that particular organism. These glands of internal secretion have been called the "tides of life" and experiments with animals as well as man has demonstrated that they do have a direct effect upon the emotional level of the organism.[5]

Each potential human nature possesses some capacities, "the inborn flexibility to acquire certain abilities."[6] Of all inborn traits these are the least perfected and definite at birth, and many, of course, are never developed but lie dormant throughout the life of the person like the many potential talents buried in Grey's Country Church Yard. Yet other flexibilities are dominant and after stimulation and development by and through the C. H. and S. G. factors, mature into expert skills as evidenced in our American culture pattern by an array of stars in all our culture complexes from racketeering to religion.

So much for the innate dynamic forces found within the organic heritage of the newly born homo sapien. But no sooner is this potential human person delivered upon the stage than he is wrapped in a blanket of culture and bound down by the chains of tradition and custom.[7] We may add here that that same culture pattern dictates whether that real blanket shall be pink or blue.

Once upon the stage of action the small neophyte is subjected to a well woven, and we may add a well worn pattern of "thinking and

[5]Ogburn and Nimkoff, Op. Cit., p. 203.

[6]R. L. Southerland and J. L. Woodward, *Introductory Sociology*, J. P. Lippincott, Dallas, 1940, p. 184.

[7]Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1934, Chapter 1.

doing." Thus he is conditioned to conform either patiently or for-
cibly to that societies' folkways, mores, taboos, beliefs and values.
He learns the language spoken by that society and is soon intro-
duced to its institutions, culture objects, and technicways. LaPiere
says:

> "The human infant is adaptable and could learn to behave in
> almost any way, but the human beings who constitute the most
> important element of his environment behave in comparatively
> fixed and highly standardized ways. The human infant for in-
> stance has no food tastes; he could as well learn to like boiled
> rat as baked pig, earth worms as chicken, mare's milk as cow's
> milk . . .
>
> "Since he is pliant and his environment is rigid, the human
> animal adjusts to his environment through the years of his in-
> fancy, childhood and youth. He learns in a variety of complex
> ways to behave in the modes deemed by those around him to be
> right and proper for one of his status . . . The ways in which
> he is taught to do these things constitute the process of social-
> ization, and what he learns is what in the end characterizes him
> as a human being.[8]"

Through the development of habits, attitudes, wishes and ideals,
the social groups in which he participates, either actively or vicar-
iously, gradually but surely in most cases imbue and incorporate in-
to his biological organism the "way of life" of that social system.

The primary groups are the first to lay hold of him and give him
a human orientation. The family, the chief of these primary groups,
consciously or unconsciously gives the bent to the socialization
process, not only by control of the cultural heritage they may con-
tain, but also by the methods they use to induce, imbue, translate, or
interpret this cultural heritage to the growing, maturing, changing
organism. While much more could be said about the family as the
prime moulder of personality, space will not permit a fuller treat-
ment of this one social group in the total socialization story.

The playgroup of his neighborhood, the church and church school
usually of the parents choice, the public or parochial school, and
later the various recreational, cultural, or organizational groups in-
to which the child is invited and joins all play their part in condi-
tioning, moulding, and shaping that eventual human nature. Not

[8]Richard T. LaPiere, *Sociology*, McGraw-Hill Company, New York, 1946,
p. 45 f.

only from each group per se, but also from the general web of community organization and group interaction and interpenetration, the individual experiences a pattern of living from which he acquires ideas, attitudes, values, and habits. These same social groups also provide the maturing and developing child a "dressing room" to prepare for wider social behavior as well as a "show window" in which to demonstrate or exhibit his cultural cloak.

Experience holds the key to each individual's personality pattern, for it is through the subjective interpretation of experience that the interaction and integration of the two heritages or factors take on meaning and become significant. In fact no trait or factor can become a part of human nature unless it is experienced in interaction.[9]

This experience is unique in that it is individualistic and different in each individual. No two organisms experience identical stimuli alike. Even identical twins with very similar organisms have been found to differ widely in personality traits.[10] Cases of brothers and, or sisters, who, even though they may have similar gene qualities, and grow up in common environments, differ greatly in the net product of socialization, are too numerous to mention.

As indicated in the formula above these similar experiences may register and deposit vastly different emotional residues into the nervous fiber of the organism. Thus in one child these experiences may leave a feeling tone of comfort, while in another right by his side a feeling of discomfort. Likewise there may be registered feelings or experiences of pleasure or pain, success or failure, positive or negative status, encouragement or inhibition. A case is known where two brothers, only two years apart in age, took a chew of tobacco from the same plug, given to them by the same father, on the same day, in the same place. One of the lads experienced such excruciating results that he never cared to take the second chew, but the brother whose unique experience brought no pain or distress, became a veteran user of chewing and smoking tobacco.

These experiences also tend to gradually build up within the child the concept of self (the subjective concept or appraisal of the totality of one's person) and in turn this self concept becomes an important factor in determining the uniqueness of consequent experiences. Thus, depending upon the value judgments of the culture within which he is being socialized, the socialee interprets one experience as good and another as bad, one moral and another unmoral, and so

[9]Guy Brown, Op. Cit., p. 70 f.
[10]Francis Brown, Op. Cit., p. 116.

he is encouraged by others as well as self consciousness to continue one behaviorism while by the same pressures he is taught to refrain from certain types of behavior, or he may indulge in them in secret, either imaginatively or overtly.

Gradually the child matures biologically and as the individual experiences this interaction with the social heritage the raw homo sapien is transformed into a human nature with a personality pattern which is rated as normal or abnormal, and is accepted or rejected by the same social groups by which and through which he has been socialized. This is often called his social type aspect and is classified in the formula as normal or abnormal.[11]

If normal human nature results from the process of socialization the personality may be further classified as an introvert, extrovert, or an ambivert. If, on the other hand, the product is socially typed as abnormal, he may be labeled as a spoiled child, a deliquent youth, or an unsocial adult, depending upon age, and either one of which may take on a multitude of variations depending again upon the behavior value judgments of the particular society being studied.

The exponent (x) of the formula indicates these various forms the human nature may take in his society, and since no life totality pattern is ever absolutely fixed or static, the use of the term tentative in the final factor of the formula is appropriate.

In conclusion we might summarize the whole process by saying that the personality (human nature) begins as a bundle of disintegrated, dynamic forces, housed in a body (organism) energized and fed by nature. This organism, endowed with numerous reflexive mechanisms and some drives, acts upon a stage set for it by society. By its social heritage, it is stimulated to behave and its pattern of action (behavior) is directed, encouraged, thwarted, inhibited, praised, punished, finally moulded by the social groups in which it participates. Through the common ground of experience, by the processes of interaction, integration, and maturation, the organism of the new born babe gradually transforms into a personality with a self-concept entity. As it begins to assert its own ego, it enters upon the secondary stage of self-control. However, he is never free from the impact and conditioning of these social factors, and the institutions of his social milieu, particularly the family, the school, the church, and the occupational groups continue the process of socialization, giving the person a human nature pattern of unique form. This becomes his life totality or personality pattern.

---

[11]Guy Brown, Op. Cit., p. 77.

Thus from simple consciousness emerges self consciousness and as self consciousness evolves into social consciousness the process of socialization of the dynamic forces is completed and the person matures into a dynamic, adjusted, or maladjusted personality and plays various roles in the social organization of his time.

T. R. Schaffler is Professor of Sociology at State Teachers College, Mankato, Minnesota.

ON PANACEAS FOR IMPROVING TEACHING
LET'S HIRE THE GOOD ONES!!

Arnold L. Goren

Recent articles appearing in many journals on the subject of evaluation of college teaching have given rise to considerable interest. Unfortunately, however, on the basis of five years close contact with students, as veterans advisor and as Executive Secretary of Student Activities at an institution of some 8,000 students, I feel compelled to take exception to several of the ideas recorded in these articles.

To record mechanistic devices for improving college teaching and then to add that these only contribute to sound judgement by responsible educators, is to avoid the unpleasant fact that in all too many situations improvement of instruction or instructors is trying to make a "pig out of a shoats ear" or a "carrot out of a cucumber". Today, it is perhaps more clear than ever, that the best way to improve instruction is to hire better teachers in the first instance.

In all too many cases the trouble can be found in the pattern of academic advancement. For example, a man develops his mastery of chemistry and decides to go into teaching and research. How does he go about getting a job? In most cases the aspiring teacher visits chairmen of departments, files a dozen applications at teacher appointment bureaus, and has his credentials sent out to prospective employers. His letters of reference state that he is an excellent student, has a pleasing personality, was Treasurer of the senior class and is Phi Betta Kappa. With luck a small, low budget University offers him a Teaching and Research Fellowship, at a very low salary. After some three years at this institution as assistant to a well known research man, our sample specimen earns his Ph.D. and goes elsewhere as an instructor and a research specialist in his field. He is now presumed to have had three years experience, and he may go up the ladder to Assistant Professor at still a third institution where his paper file, and his references, (which now stamp him as a young man of promise with a great deal to offer the profession) are supplemented by a personal interview and a meeting with the departmental staff. As a result of these meetings, it is clear that our specimen has a pleasant personality, "knows his stuff" and will make a good contribution to the field of knowledge in his specialty. He is then hired. Twelve years later and now Associate Professor, he may suddenly be tapped for the chairmanship of a department in a neigh-

boring University, both as a result of his work in the field and his contacts in the local professional association. There he is, a bright, fairly young chairman, (a scientific specialist of renown) and a man who couldn't "teach his way out of a paper bag that was soaking wet," as my students say. Perhaps his first duty is to hire a new graduate assistant and teaching fellow. Upon examination of this man's papers, he might smile as he reads "Phi Beta Kappa, Treasurer of the senior class, good personality and an outstanding student of chemistry."

And so the pattern is continued, year after year, man after man, (and of course students after students). Now if our man were an exception to the general rule, he might have studied teaching methods on his own time, and concluded that the courses are or are not particularly valuable depending on the individual. At any rate, after twenty years, he might very well be considered an "Educator and Scientist" of note, whose students for twenty years had been saying, "Old Jones can't teach, but he's a great guy, and is a famous man in his field." This picture may be painted in colors too dark, but there is a large element of truth present in it. The pattern of advancement is the element which needs change. Since all of us cannot agree on the best methods for good teaching, or even the *ends* of good teaching our solution must come from characteristics the good teacher must possess and the ways in which we can locate these characteristics. These ideas should help in the hiring of better teachers.

1. Try not to hire a man *to teach* unless you can see him in the classroom on at least two occasions. Give him the benefit of choice of class and subject. If he is visiting you at your institution, arrange for him to teach at least a single class. This will not guarantee that he will always teach well, but it will make it considerably more probable that he will at least *be able* to teach well.

2. Let him know what you like to see in a classroom situation and watch his reaction.

3. Observe his expression and listen to his voice range as he teaches. Is he a mumbler or a droner?

4. Observe the responses of his students in the class he has chosen to have you visit.

5. See if he tries anything (some device perhaps) to stimulate his class and observe the manner in which his students react to his personality (after class near his desk, in his office, and on the campus).

6. Ask him about his students — "What sort of *people* do they seem to be?" Note his knowledge of them and see if he has a sense of humor and a sense of proportion in regard to them.

7. Go to a local affair where he has to meet students and faculty socially. Perhaps a ballgame or dance of some kind would be best to observe his uninhibited reactions.

The responses to these situations should give you a better picture of your man than any college file of references can ever supply. *They will tell you if he is the sort of man students will admire and respect because he is the sort of man that they would like to be some day.* Your own honest review will tell you if your new Assistant Professor is really a teacher with a capital T or if he is just another poor old Jones in the making.

8. Whenever possible hire a man or woman who has studied (if only briefly) some Educational Psychology, Philosophy and even some methodology. These things familiarize an individual with the ways in which students learn, and such knowledge is essential to a teacher. Your new Assistant Professor may be an Essentialist or an Experimentalist—both schools have produced great teaching—but at least he will have arrived at his beliefs as a result of some familiarity with the professional background of teaching.

9. Examine his writings and professional background to see if your man has the scholarship necessary to most good teaching. Panaceas, like ratings, supervisions, library records, competitive examination scores, etc. are all incompatible with current concepts of academic freedom and tenure. Further, they are all useless, in a situation where grades are sometimes not even standardized within a single department. How can we depend on teacher ratings when we are not universally agreed on what constitutes good teaching or even the ends and aims of "good teaching"? The lack of general agreement on these basics make the mechanical suggestions impossible to put into general usage at present.

However, the minimal hiring technique I have suggested can be universally applied, and it is still not being used in a great many institutions that are famous for their great scholars and infamous for their poor teachers. All sorts of committee structures could be devised to put this scheme into effect, but in most schools the department head is still doing the hiring and the use of this guide is tailor made to his likes and dislikes as an administrator.

I am aware of the many other suggestions such as licensing of college personnel, etc., but given the present situation, I am of the

opinion that these ideas are more or less utopian in scope. Perhaps other suggestions involving participation in professional organizations and committees are sometimes excellent critera for evaluating teaching. More often, however, they seem to result in the promotion of rotarians and joiners as well as legitimate scholars and teachers. At this point let me add my own utopian idea to the already large collection of those marked for "long range action".

One large University has recently instituted a course called Apprentice College Teaching. The man or woman who wishes to become a college teacher is made to serve an arduous semester under the guidance of a committee of teachers at the University. He teaches classes in his own field, and learns the elementary fundamentals of teaching. He is usually a young person selected on the basis of departmental criteria and most of those chosen have gone on to teach in many colleges. However, every so often, a young man of promise discovers that he can go on to other fields secure in the knowledge that teaching is not for him. This last factor has already saved many thousand student-hours of wasted time, both in the classroom and in the lecture hall. If, (and here is the utopian idea) every college teacher would be required to take such a course, his docket or file might state:

1. He is vital in the classroom, for example, etc.

2. He makes use of new ideas in his teaching, for example, he etc. . . .

3. He maintains excellent student-teacher relationships, for example, he etc. . . .

Certainly such a docket would be a considerable improvement! The file could then go on to describe him in terms that we already have discussed. But every individual would have a teaching record to start with and it would be possible to observe every aspirant in action in the classroom.

The old saw would then really read as it properly should: *"Good* experience is often the best teacher." With the background of this experience, perhaps the college teacher will really be just that.

Arnold L. Goren is Executive Secretary of Student Activities at New York University.

ROMANTIC LOVE AND ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS:
A CULTURAL COMPARISON

Milton Kurland

Americans, unlike most other peoples, believe that "falling in love" is the natural and proper prelude to marriage. The American culture pattern assumes that supreme happiness is to be found in love, that love is all that matters. Emphasis is placed on sexual attraction, physical beauty, and emotional response. Glamorous notions of ro mantic love control the adolescent period and tend to dominate the imagination of the individual even in later years.[1] But while Americans are constantly searching for the "right" person they are often unaware that other factors than romance enter into the process of selecting a mate.

In the consanguine type of family, predominant in other culture patterns, the economic factor is one of the primary considerations in the selection of a mate. In many societies the primary motive for marriage is the founding of a family as a self-sufficient economic aggregate.[2] In many primitive tribes economic life is so organized that the collaboration of the sexes is required in the daily routine of life.

We may ask: (1) What is romantic love? (2) What has been the course of its development (3) Has it been, or is it now a factor in marriage arrangements in other culture patterns, as contrasted with the economic factor? (4) In the American culture pattern does romantic love act as a detriment to the ability of the family to become economically self-maintaining? (5) What are the implications for the American educational system?

Love has different connotations for different people. Several types of love have been distinguished: sexual or erotic feelings, tender or affectionate feelings. The latter are identified with romantic love.[3]

The term "romantic", according to the dictionary pertains to the literature and art of the Romance peoples, i.e., those whose languages are descended from the Latin. It also means "founded upon

[1]E. W. Burgess & H. J. Locke, *The Family,* (New York: American Book Co., 1945), chap. 12, passim.

[2]Robert H. Lowie, *Primitive Society,* (New York: Liveright Publishing Co., 1947), p. 65.

[3]Joseph K. Folsom, *The Family and Democratic Society* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1943), pp. 365-378.

or influenced by what is extravagantly ideal, sentimental rather than rational; visionary; wild or picturesque; pertaining to or suggestive of the strange and fantastic; hence, fictitious and improbable".

Historical Background of Romantic Love

The statement has been made that romantic love "is a modern sentiment, less than a thousand years old, and not to be found among savages, barbarians or Orientals".[4] While it is true that romantic love in connection with marriage is not encouraged in the Orient, nor among primitive peoples, there is a strong possibility that this sentiment has existed for thousands of years. It is erroneous to assume that because they seldom choose their own mates, people in primitive cultures cannot feel love.[5] The Old Testament gives an example of romantic love in the devotion and zeal which Jacob displayed in his efforts to obtain Rachel as his wife. Nor can we overlook the romanticism of the Song of Songs, one of the oldest examples of love poetry extant. A notable romantic marriage in the period shortly after the destruction of the Judean state by the Romans is that of Akiba the shepherd, who became a famous rabbi, and Rachel, daughter of wealthy Kalba-Sabua.[6] In Babylonia, in the third century of the Christian Era, Abba-Areka forbade the Jews to solemnize marriages which had not been preceded by courtship. He enjoined fathers not to marry off their daughters unless the latter gave consent. Furthermore, he admonished all men who wished to marry to make the acquaintance of the maiden of their choice before betrothal, lest, when disappointed in the marriage, their conjugal love should turn to hate.[7]

In the patriarchal family of the ancient Greeks marriage was regarded as a contract entered into for family ends. Nevertheless, the legends of Alcestis and Admetus, of Orpheus and Eurydice may be taken as indications that romantic love was not unknown to the ancient Hellenes. Among the Romans too, economic considerations and family interests governed the choice of a marriage partner and it was assumed that if the girl did not openly refuse her consent she was willing to accept the arrangement made by her parents. From

---

[4]Finck, quoted in Burgess and Locke, *op. cit.,* p. 366.

[5]Lowie, *Social Organization* (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1948), pp. 221 ff.

[6]Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews* (1949 ed., Phila., Jewish Pub. Soc. of America), II, 351.

[7]Graetz, *op. cit.,* II, 516.

the frequency of divorce in the Roman Empire one might assume that there, as in modern America, the search for romantic love was constantly going on in certain social circles.

During the so-called Dark Ages, Western Europe, preoccupied with the invasions of the Germanic tribes from the North and the incursions of the Arabs from the South, had neither time nor spirit for romantic love. Among the Germanic peoples who lacked contact with the Latin spirit, we find nothing like "courtly love".[8]

It was at the end of the eleventh century that "courtly love" appeared quite suddenly in Languedoc, and during the next two centuries its ideals were spread throughout western Europe.[9] "Courtly love" tended to idealize woman. Perhaps it were better to say "the lady" since the lower classes were excluded from its practice.[10] Others hold that romantic love as we know it today derives from the social life of the royal courts of Europe, particularly France, in the seventeenth century.[11] Romance at first connoted extra-marital love. It was not until the eighteenth century that Samuel Richardson, who is credited with having been the first to say that love is needed in marriage, helped to legitimize love and bring it within the marital union.[12]

Romantic Love in America

The emphasis on love as a prerequisite for marriage in our culture pattern had its beginnings in the early history of our country If we accept the veracity of Longfellow's "Courtship of Myles Standish", the personal choice of a marriage partner based on romantic love can be traced back to Plymouth Colony. Even so austere a personality as Cotton Mather was not beyond recording in his diary that a young gentlewoman of "Incomparable accomplishments" confessed herself to be charmed with his person to such degree that she importuned him to make her his.[13]

---

[8]Clive Staples Lewis, *The Allegory of Love* (London: Oxford University Press, 1936) p. 9.

[9]Ibid., p. 2

[10]Ibid., p. 35.

[11]Burgess and Locke, *op. cit.*, p. 366.

[12]Hugo G. Beigel, "Romantic Love", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. XVI, No. 3, June, 1951.

[13]Cotton Mather's Diary, quoted in Arthur W. Calhoun, *A Social History of the American Family* (1945 ed., New York, Barnes and Noble, Inc.), I,52.

James Franklin, writing of the early history of the United States, avers that "the matrimonial state is so much the more happy and consequently the more reverenced, as the freedom and sanctity of marriage depends entirely on the will of the parties".[14] Side by side with romantic marriages there were also many marriages for mercenary reasons. Judge Sewell's entries in his diary describing his haggling over a marriage settlement is illustrative of a custom which was evidently widespread in colonial times.

Romantic love, as a basis for marriage, is a modern development, almost unknown to the patriarchal form of family which predominates in most culture patterns other than the American. The stress placed upon it in our novels, drama, films, and advertising indicate that it is in harmony with our culture.[15]

Some Other Culture Patterns

In those culture patterns where the consanguine type of family predominates, romantic love of the type which is the ideal in our own culture plays but little part in marriage although it is not altogether unknown. It is least often a factor in areas where the rigors of life make it difficult to eke out an existence without the full cooperation of all members of the family.

Among many peoples marriage is regarded as a social and economic arrangement. This, at least until recent years, was as true in France, Greece, Ireland and other European countries as it was among the Dobu, Kwakiutl, Manus and many others of the primitive tribes.[16] On the other hand, it would seem from Malinowski's description that among the Trobriand Islanders the young people, in the majority of cases, exercise their own initiative in choosing their mates.[17] Increasingly this also seems to be becoming the mode among the Kgatla, a Bantu tribe in Africa, as a result of increasing educa-

[14]Quoted in Calhoun, *op. cit.*, II, 31.

[15]R. M. MacIver and C. H. Page, *Society* (New York, Rinehart and Co., Inc. 1949), p. 262.

[16]Cf. Lowie, *Social Organization,* chaps. 5, 10; Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture* (Pelican Books Edition; New York, Penguin Books, Inc., 1946), chaps. 5, 6; Margaret Mead, *Coming of Age in Samoa,* pp. 104 ff., and *Growing Up in New Guinea,* pp. 67, 82, 170, 174, (reprinted in *From the South Seas,* New York: Wm. Morrow & Co., 1939).

[17]Cited by Joseph K. Folsom, *The Family and Democratic Society* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1943) pp. 9ff.

tion and migration to work in the "European" towns.[18] While some love marriages are taking place among the Hindus of Bengal, these are not in accordance with Hindu custom for they are intercaste marriages. Generally, marriages among these people are still arranged by the families.[19]

Among the Mundugumor arranged marriages are the rule. Nevertheless there does exist among them a "violent preference for the individual selection of one's mate".[20] A Mundugumor girl whose lover has no sister to offer in exchange for her, or who is betrothed to another, may elope with her lover and a violent battle may then ensue between the relatives of the pair. American movie-goers seeing a plot like this portrayed on the screen would doubtless think nothing could be more romantic.

The ideal of marriage among the Arapesh of New Guinea is essentially a domestic, not a romantic one. They regard affection and suddenly aroused passion as antithetical.[21] By contrast, the American ideal of romance as delineated by the movies is an instant biological attraction which seems sufficient to tell a man that he has found his mate.[22]

Romantic Love and Economic Factors in America

The tendency of the hard-headed Puritan middle class to make mercenary marriages had been brought over to the new world from Europe.[23] Nevertheless, romantic love, as we have indicated above, was not strange to them. Nor is woman's place in our economic life a new development. Just as among the primitive tribes the primary motive for marriage is the establishment of a self-sufficient economic aggregate, so too in early America women played an important economic role. In the eighteenth century women in New England were engaged in a number of occupations, in New York they were active as merchants, shop-keepers, ship-owners and Indian traders and of-

[18]I. Schepera, *Married Life in An African Tribe* (New York: Sheridan House, Inc., 1941), passim.

[19]D. N. Mitra, "A Hindu Marriage in Bengal" and "A Hindu Wife", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LII, No. 2, 1946.

[20]Margaret Mead, Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies, pp. 215-220 (reprinted in *From the South Seas*).

[21]Ibid., p. 99.

[22]Hortense Powdermaker, *Hollywood* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1951), p. 323.

[23]Calhoun, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 56, ff.

ten held power of attorney to carry on a husband's business in his absence.[24] In the Southern colonies marriages for economic reasons were not uncommon, although there sentiment seems to have figured more than it did in the North.[25]

In the factory towns of America, during the nineteenth century, employment was frequently on a family basis. The Sixth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of the Statistics of Labor indicated that sixty-four percent of the heads of families had to rely on the assistance of their wives and children to earn enough to supply the needs of their families.[26] In 1880 it was reported that in many instances workingmen's wives had supported their families almost entirely for several years.[27]

Despite what we popularly consider to be the American attitude toward romantic marriage economic factors do enter into consideration. Many writers, noting the increasing proportion of married women gainfully employed outside the home, attribute this to the increased freedom of women and their acquisition of a status closer to that of men. The fact remains that for many American wives employment outside the home is not only a matter of choice but an economic necessity. A study made by the Census Bureau in 1946 indicated that more than one and a half million women were the sole earners, and about two and a half million more were the principal earners, in their families, totalling twelve percent of the nation's families.[28]

A more recent report indicates that the lower the income of the husband, the more likelihood the wife will be gainfully employed.[29]

Since 1890 the proportion of married women gainfully employed outside the home has increased more rapidly than the population in every decade. In 1890, according to census figures 4.6 percent of all married women in the American population were gainfully employed outside the home. By 1940 this proportion had increased to 15.2 percent, and in 1951 was estimated to have reached 27.0 percent.[30]

---

[24]Ibid., pp. 101, 169.

[25]Ibid., pp. 253-255.

[26]Cited in Calhoun, *op. cit.*, III, 67.

[27]Ibid., III, 69.

[28]Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, Bulletin No. 242, *Handbook of Facts on Women Workers* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 60.

[29]Ibid., p. 62.

[30]Burgess & Locke, *op. cit.*, p. 504; Women's Bureau, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

The fact that an increasing proportion of women continue in employment after marriage, and do so because of economic reasons, seems to indicate that romantic love, while important in the initial stages of courtship, is not so all-predominating a factor in marriage in our American culture pattern as some people have claimed. It is linked up with the ability of the young married pair to form an economically self-maintaining unit in ways approved by our own modern culture pattern. The economic aims are there, even though not always overtly enunciated.

That romance is not entirely divorced from economic considerations in the American culture pattern is confirmed by a recent study in which twenty percent of both men and women in their conception of an ideal mate had ruled out those of different economic status.[31] The movies too, so far-reaching in their effect on American thinking and patterns of behavior, frequently show the women as arranging things to enable their men to achieve success. This pattern of masculine success in a woman dominated world, it is claimed, reflects a major aspect of American child-training.[32] That the managing wife often behaves like a mother to her son is not inconsistent with the romantic ideal in which the man seeks a wife who reminds him of his mother.[33]

While romantic love seems to be the dominant ideal in American marriage the actual selection of a mate is conditioned by other factors which tend to act as controls imposed by our culture pattern. One of these is our class system, which also involves certain economic factors.[34] Others involve age, race, religion, and ethnic origin.[35]

Conclusion

We may conclude, then, that:

1. Romantic love is older than the thousand years attributed as its age.

---

[31]Burgess & Locke, *op. cit.*, p. 417.

[32]M. Wolfenstein & M. Leites, *Movies* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950), pp. 61 ff.

[33]Cf. J. C. Flugel, *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Family* (6th Ed., London: Hogarth Press, 1939), p. 105.

[34]Cf. W. L. Warner & P. S. Lunt, *The Social Life of A Modern Community* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), Chap. 6, passim.

[35]Burgess & Locke, *op cit.*, Chap. 13; Folsom, *op. cit.*, pp. 525-543.

2. Romantic love in the American culture pattern has existed side by side with marriages arranged for economic reasons since earliest colonial days.

3. Despite our emphasis on romantic love those considerations which influenced parents, in other culture patterns, in the selection of a mate for their offspring are included as positive criteria affecting the free choice of marriage partners even at the present time.

4. These other criteria, though narrowing the range of possible choices of a marriage partner, are not necessarily incompatible with our cultural ideal of romantic love.

5. For American education, therefore, there is indicated the increasing necessity for a type of family-life education which will fit women to carry on their roles as wife and mother concurrently with their contribution to the economic self-maintenance of the family, a type of education which will fit both men and women to co-operate in making the family a stable, cohesive unit which will give to all its members the security, emotional as well as economic, which they need.

Milton Kurland is Assistant Case Supervisor; Instructor in Field Work, Adelphi College, School of Social Work, and teaches Sociology at Hunter College, School of General Studies.

PHYSICAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL, CULTURAL AND SOCIAL FORCES AFFECTING SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Donald S. Dushkind

NATURE OF SCIENTIFIC ENDEAVOR

" 'Action' is a process in the actor-situation system which has motivational significance to the individual actor, or, in the case of a collectivity, its component individuals. This means that the orientation of the corresponding action processes has a bearing on the attainment of gratifications or the avoidance of deprivations of the relevant actor, whatever concretely in the light of the relevant personality structures these may be."[1] Since scientific endeavor is a type of action, all of it has motivational significance to the scientist (actor). The disinterest or objectivity in scientific endeavor is actually only within a subjective frame of reference.

Science, as a method of learning, cannot be placed in a category separate from the laws that govern human behavior. It has been said that the learning behavior of a laboratory rat cannot be called science. However, if laws of learning for human beings are to be affected by extrapolations from experiments with rats, then the scientific action of human beings must be considered as being more complex manifestations of laws of learning common to laboratory rats and human beings who are not scientists.

Since all human action is governed by physical and psychological laws, scientific investigations are affected not only by laws of learning but also by laws of physical and emotional development. Considering the behavior of a scientist as that of a human being who lives in groups, his scientific action is also governed by laws governing cultural and social phenomena.

Science is merely a more highly systematized method of learning than non-science. It never determines absolute truth. It only brings human beings closer to the truth. There is no way for human beings to determine absolute truth, since nobody's perceptual mechanisms are perfect. It follows from this that man cannot build perfect measuring instruments, magnifiers, and condensers.

The writer believes that science is a systematic method of learning having the following four characteristics: (1) empirical validity;

---

[1]Talcott Parsons, THE SOCIAL SYSTEM, The Free Press, Glencoe, 1951, p. 4. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

80

(2) logical precision of the particular proposition; (3) logical consistency of the mutual implications of propositions; and (4) range of mutually verified implications.[2] However, conceptions of what science is vary. Persons professing to be scientists do not always accurately describe the processes they use to formulate "scientific'" conclusions. In fact, this is an impossibility, since complete self-psychoanalysis is impossible. Furthermore, persons professing to be scientists do not necessarily have in mind at all times while they are engaging in scientific endeavor the basic scientific principles which they may at times call the basis of their actions. Examples of the subjective influences in procedures of persons professing to be scientists are demonstrated at meetings of scientific societies in which dispute over methodology sometimes culminates in obviously disturbed emotions and strained social interaction. This happens although a scientist can specialize in one of the four characteristics in his type of research and yet cooperatively have his range of research integrated within a total systemic unit in which the other three characteristics operate.

Before an empirical study can be made of relationships between subjects, an enabling relationship (observational, manipulatory, and/or symbolic) must be made between the subjects of study (situation) and the scientist (actor). An observational relationship is one that permits observation of the subjects in their natural movements. A manipulatory relationship is one that makes for manipulaion of the subjects. A symbolic relationship is one in which the scientist does not actually observe or manipulate the subjects of study, but learns about them and their movements by reading or hearing reports or by studying diagrammatic or photographic reproductions. Often tools are necessary to effectuate any of the three types of enabling relationship. Sometimes a multiplicity of persons in cooperative and/or hierarchical relationships is necessary to effectuate the necessary relationship.

In addition to being aspects of physical systems of action, the actions of the scientist in achieving a particular enabling relationship and formulating hypotheses and conclusions as a result of his study are aspects of psychological, cultural, and social systems of action. Therefore, the ideal of disinterested scientific endeavor, as espoused by many persons, is impossible. The scientist may have as his value-orientation merely personel satisfaction without other goals. If his discovery is not the concern of anyone but himself, and he is not

_____

[2]*Ibid*, p. 335.

dependent upon scientific endeavor for his livelihood, then it may be feasible for him to accomplish scientific fetes of value to no one but himself. However, in most cases the scientific product must be of value to persons other than the scientist without the goal of personal satisfaction from the scientific fete *per se*. If the scientist's goals are social recognition or financial profit, then his accomplishments must be pleasing to the individuals or groups that give him the social recognition or financial profit. Also, the converse is true.

Particular types of scientific endeavor as systems of human action within an environment of human beings are functions of the interaction among physical, psychological, cultural, and social forces. A particular personality does not make a person produce scientific work unless: he is physically qualified, the cultural forces that encourage such action exist, and the society offers the facilities for such action to one in the particular status-role position of the particular individual. A particular culture does not produce scientific endeavor of particular types unless the personalities capable of meeting the requirements of scientific endeavor are in particular status-role positions for which the society supplies the facilities for such action. A particular society does not produce scientific endeavor of particular types unless the potentially scientific personalities receive the encouragement of the cultures within which they live.

The physical qualifications are with regard to the necessary acuity and endurance to perform the operation necessary for observation, manipulation and/or symbolic study. The psychological qualifications are with regard to the suitability of the personality of the scientist at the particular time. The personality includes characteristics of knowledge and attitudes. These physical and psychological qualifications in turn must have an interactive relationship with the cultural and societal surroundings of the scientist at the particular time. The nature of these interactions are with regard to the physical facilities, cultural acceptance or encouragement, and societal sanctions for one in the scientist's particular status-role at the particular time. The physical facilities refer to those necessary mechanical, electrical, spatial, etc. facilities that enable the individual to augment his personal physical and psychological capabilities. The cultural surroundings at the particular time may encourage or discourage certain allegedly scientific activities or it may accept certain types of allegedly scientific results. These factors strongly affect the types of observation, manipulation, and/or symbolic study undertaken or avoided and the facilities used. The cultural surroundings involve not necessarily one culture but rather cultures and their sub-cultures in collateral and/

or concentric relationships to each other as they affect in varying proportions the actions of the scientist at the particular time. The societal surroundings refer to societies in concentric and/or collateral relationships to each other at the particular time with reference to the prescriptions, allowances, and proscriptions for the behavior of the scientist in relationship to the subjects to be studied. Each of these forces can be re-equilibrated with or without purposeful and conscious effort by the scientist at particular times.

Much re-equilibration has occured in the older sciences in this regard. However, the sociologist is extremely limited in the types of experimentation he can perform because of the facts that in sociology: the subjects very closely represent parts of the surrounding cultures and societies, there are reciprocal psychological effects between the sociologist and the subjects of experimentation, and the sociologist rarely can achieve by personal development or external instrumentation the necessary enabling relationships. Contemporary American culture and society have not yet been conducive to substantial sociological research, and under present conditions few persons can achieve or be ascribed the personalities that would permit anywhere as near the scientific objectivity in application to sociological processes as is commonly achieved in application to the physical processes. Whereas in the physical sciences, physical mechanisms can be developed to increase man's perceptual abilities (make more scientifically valuable his relationship to the subject matter) by the use of magnifiers, calipers, condensers, etc. such is not as much the case in sociology.

CONDITIONS FOR, AND COMMON FALLACIES IN, SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

The research of a sociologist, just as that of physical scientists is affected by: his physical and personality traits, the attitudes of the culture within which he lives, and the facilities and limitations imposed by the society within which he lives for one in his status-role position at a particular time. Each of these factors can not, and need not, be uniform; since a research project is the resultant of certain forces in an equilibrating system. Although the workers in the physical sciences are subject to the same conditions, it is not as obvious because of the easier demand and acceptance for work that is of apparent importance and unthreatening to the personalities, cultures, and/or societies involved.

Different subject matter and different facilities require different types of research. Only sociologists with certain personalities can

perform each of the types, the culture must have some measure of acceptance for the particular types of research, and the society must provide the facilities that the particular personality and culture need for the work. This is exemplified in the fact that the methods and subject matter of sociology vary markedly from country to country. Furthermore, within the United States, they vary from region to region; within the same region, they vary from university to university, and within the same university, they vary from professor to professor.

The sociologist, because of the nature of his subject matter, is extremely limited in the types of research techniques he may use. He cannot choose subjects as easily as scientists who use inanimate or subhuman subjects. His physical limitation as a human being prohibit him from experimenting with certain data. For example, in studying certain data of international affairs he cannot live an adequate number of generations to completely observe certain sociological processes in international relations. He may be able to take part in the manipulation of international relations if he is that politically astute, but this requires a great deal of skill and luck. Because of cultural and societal opposition, he cannot take an infant and develop him into a delinquent for experimental purposes. He can take himself as an example of the subject matter he is studying. Although projection can be a danger in such a use, it is often a helpful technique in formulating ideas about the actions of others. He cannot study the sociological processes accompanying the development of a new means of transportation until that new means of transportation is invented and available. In view of these facts, the following may be considered as the techniques to which a sociologist is restricted in his research.[3] They either do not come into conflict with physical laws, technological goals, and/or common ethical concepts; or meet with only small opposition on ethical grounds:

1. Historical techniques:
    a. Observation of self or others as variables are naturally manipulated.
    b. Analysis of unexplained, or religiously or magically rationalized, historical residues and their correlates.
    c. Reviewing of observations and analysis of others.
    d. Reviewing of experiments.

---

[3] Because of the experiential and conceptual limitations of the writer, the socio-cultural contexts referred to from this point on must be considered as essentially American.

2. Comparative techniques:

    a. Observation of interaction in different groups or individuals possessing pertinent similarities and differences.

    b. Analysis of comparative data collated by observers, which may be unexplained or rationalized religiously or magically.

    c. Reviewing of analyses of others.

    d. Comparing observations of different observers of same phenomena.

3. Experimental techniques:

    a. Observation of self and/or others as observer manipulates variables during process of technology.

    b. Observation of self and/or others as observer manipulates harmlessly, or for payment, variables in laboratory.

    c. Experimentation with low-status persons (e.g., prisoners).

    d. Animal experimentation.

Sometimes more difficult for acceptance by the scientist or others than the techniques of research used are the conclusions. The scientist's emotional make-up may be such that a validly derived conclusion that has been empirically verified by the most rigid tests may be unacceptable to him. A normally objective scientist may unconsciously distort his observations and the rational processes used to formulate the conclusion in order to discard it or modify it. This may occur when a scientist, whose ego has been bolstered by his having made himself famous as the owner of a particular theory or his having followed a premise for most of his life, feels his ego threatened by disproof of the premise.

What may be substituted for rigid adherence to scientific method in such situations is an arbitrary authoritarian approach. That is, the scientist holding the greatest power prohibits the contradictory evidence or theory, with some type of rationalization, from being advocated within his hearing or sight. The rationalizations may be distortion of either the contrary evidence, or the theory, or the method used to formulate the theory. The rationalizations may appear to be denials of: the integrity of the presenter of new evidence, or a new theory, or the validity of his method. This type of situation occurs in universities where faculty members stifle student scholarliness or where senior faculty members stifle the scholarliness of junior faculty members. It occurs also in non-academic research

situations. The scientist who is deviating thus from objectivity is easily supported by his societally designated authoritarian position, and he may be supported by the cultural attitudes by which his status-role position in society is closely affected. If the cultural attitudes support the person in an inferior status-role position, the person in the superior status-role position may be all the more emotionally disturbed and may attempt to be all the more suppressive of his status-role inferior. Following this may be a forced resignation from either party, in accordance with the strength of the opinions of the even higher societally designated officials at the time, which in turn is affected by the higher officials' degree of dependence upon the current proximal cultural attitudes toward the conflicting ideas.

In making proposals for sociological research, methods of studying the sociological processes are often impractical. If the data are too cumbersome, often only that portion of the data that is manipulatable is used to formulate theories with regard to the total data.

A common fallacy is the postulate that the whole is not equal to the sum of its parts, but rather that the adding of certain parts forms a new unit that is distinct from the originally added parts. The data used to lead to this postulate are not homogeneous data and therefore not able to be added into a new unit. Furthermore, the whole may appear greater than the sum of its parts because more parts exist within the whole than are observable by human perceptual organs and instruments. Furthermore, the whole may appear to be less than the sum of its parts, since individual parts of the whole may also be parts of another whole which may not be observable to the examiner.

One who espouses the concept that the whole is not equal to the sum of its parts may be one whose ego is threatened by precision in analysis of sociological processes. He may be one whose approach to problems in general is authoritarian. For example, the acceptance of arbitrary ascription of authority may correspond to the arbitrary ascription of new and separate qualities to the product of combined parts. This may be true also of cultures and societies. For example, formal sociology appears to have been strongest in Germanic cultures. Formal sociology may be a more acceptable approach to analysis of sociological processes to societal officials who do not wish much of the rationality of the status quo to be questioned.[4]

---

[4]The writer presents this thought as an hypothesis based upon limited observations, and not as a scientific conclusion. It would require very great empirical and systemic research to determine how much this hypothesis corresponds to the facts.

IMPEDIMENTS TO INTEGRATION OF RESEARCH AMONG
SOCIOLOGISTS, AND OF RESEARCH WITH TECHNOLOGY

Some sociological research projects require more time and effort than others. Some sociologists can accomplish more in the same space of time than others. Some cultures and societies are more helpful to sociologists than others. Some projects need more than one scientist, while others need only one. Some sociologists can use equally as cumbersome material with greater scientific value than others. A common fallacy in criticizing sociological research is taking the research out of context. There are many different kinds of questions asked in sociology that are on different levels of abstraction in the range from specific to middle to general range theory. A research project on the level of specific range theory may be criticized from the level of general range theory, and vice versa. Similarly with middle range theory. Similar situations exist with projects whose goal is plausible definition or hypothesizing rather than definitive conclusion or theorization. Such criticisms appear to come often from personalities that require their conceptions of science to fit into the limited types of research of which they are capable. One whose ego can accept recognition of one's own limitations despite the ability of others in other areas, or who can integrate his own limited work with those of others, is not as likely to criticize with the same fallacy such sociological research. Similar situations exist with regard to cultures and societies. For example, in American socio-cultural situations, where immediate profit is demanded and least threatening, specific range sociological theory is most acceptable.

Sometimes the most rewarded work is actually the least scientific, for many people pay for what they want to hear rather than scientific conclusions. Of course, the converse is true also. This is exemplified most clearly in the far greater popularity of the proclamations of politicians than the theories of social scientists. Although in the Franklin D. Roosevelt presidential era social scientists were made use of in the formulation of national policies in certain areas, such persons were referred to derogatorily as "the brain trust". The end of the Roosevelt era has been accompanied by a decrease in the use of social scientists in American governmental actions. Even when useable, unless the scientist is also a skillful politician, he is generally relegated to a small niche from which his sociological findings can be accepted without presentation to the public or can be re-worded or distorted enough for public acceptance. If the findings threaten the

egoes of the politicians for whom he works, he may lose his job. Even if he is protected by legally supported tenure rights, the functionaries within the specific societal structures governing his job can make it unpleasant enough for him to force a resignation, or they can invoke some legal rationalization to enact a dismissal.

Sociologists are frequently confused as to how to achieve best the goals of their research. Those sociologists who do not have a technological goal for their research can logically be concerned only with purely personal goals; e. g., the satisfaction of a completed piece of research or an additional publication that may lead to an immediate financial profit or to an academic promotion. Those who work for industrial organizations are the most likely to be required to have their research presented in a form that most easily can be transformed into social technology. Many of the sociologists who profess general social welfare goal appear confused as to how to achieve it. They frequently are ignorant of the processes involved in social technology. Whether in the ancient social technology of politics that rarely identifies itself with science, or the recent social technology of social work that often identifies itself with science, there is little reference to works of scientific research.

Since successful social technology requires manipulation of relationships between certain forces in certain ways to particular degrees at particular times, and since the action may be required before a thorough analysis of the interactions can be completed, the successful social technologist must be conditioned to act with the appropriate degree of skill and force at the appropriate times. This fact has promoted a separation between practitioners and scientists and between "practice" and "theory". But the research worker must be conditioned similarly for his research work. Whereas it is true that some people are better in technology *per se* than in scientific investigation *per se* and vice versa, the most effective social technologist is likely to be the one who is appropriately conditioned and also has the scientific information to strengthen his conditioning and action when acute analysis of the situation is indicated. The current situation is one in which often the conditioning of the social technologist is lacking in training in systematic investigation of the nature of the subjects and forces to be manipulated. Furthermore, the techniques of the sociologist and that of the social technologist are relatively little known one to the other. In other words, communication between sociologists of scientific findings and social technologists of data valuable for scientific study is predominantly inefficient. Much of sociological research that is oriented to a social techno-

logical goal is published in forms and distributed in circles that social technologists rarely consult.

Clergymen, politicians, teachers, physicians, and lawyers are examples of traditional social technologists. Professional social technologists such as social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists are recent entries into the activities hitherto performed by the traditional social technologists. Because of the more traditional faith in the conventional social technologists, motivation for help-seeking contact is more easily established with them than with the new types of professional social technologists. The traditional social technologists have had little recognition of formalized sociological findings, since their status-roles existed long before the existence of the status-role of a sociologist. A problem frequently not recognized or avoided by sociologists with technological goals is how to bring to such social technologists information to help make their work more effective in achieving certain goals. Many sociologists feel that the completion of a work in "sociological" language to be placed on library shelves is enough to achieve their goal of ultimate technological use. Actually most sociological research *per se* is put in terminology that is suited to the frame of reference of the sociologist; i. e., it refers to broader classifications of subject matter. The non-sociologically oriented social technologist is likely to be concerned with fewer subjects in the classifications, and therefore the information must be given in less generalizing terms to the social technologist. Furthermore, when there are certain premises held in irreconcilable disagreement by the sociologist and the social technologist, profitable communication one way or both ways is still possible. Some causal explanations of interactions are independent of, or are not completely dependent upon, some of the basic premises. In such situations the irreconcilable premises need not be discussed, while the reconcilable or mutual premises can be taken as a point of departure for discussion.

In view of the great varieties of abilities and disabilities of sociologists, if a social technological goal is to be reached more effectively, there must be greater integration of the various phases of the work. Sociologists who want their work effectively communicated to the customarily limited social technologists, but who can use only "sociolgical" terminology, could have their work communicated to technologists by some persons more skilled in such communication. Such interpreters may or may not be very skilled in sociological research.

Furthermore, for the procurement of data, sociologists who are incapable of performing social technology themselves can benefit from reports of, and contacts with, pure social technologists.

Some sociologists can also perform social technology. This can make of experimental value vast areas of human interaction as yet only little used. Most experimentation that can be made with human beings must, because of cultural evaluations and societal sanctions, be limited to social technology. Although for certain low status-role persons like prisoners, etc., exceptions can be made, the vast majority of such technology must be of a nature that is presumed to be socially constructive by the immediate authorities or socio-cultural environment.

All persons are in some ways social technologists; i. e., all persons do put some knowledge to systematic use for the manipulation of social forces. Therefore, communications between the sociologist and the layman are subject to conditions similar to those for communication between the sociologist and the social technologist. The actions and conceptions of actions of laymen often can be important sources of data, much of which are equivalent to experimental data to sociologists. Of course, transferring abstract sociological theory to concrete thinking laymen usually requires even more skill than that required in making the appropriate transference to professional social technologists.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Frank, Jerome: COURTS ON TRIAL, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1949.

Parsons, Talcott: THE SOCIAL SYSTEM, The Free Press, Glencoe, 1951.
———, and Edward A. Shils (eds.): TOWARD A. GENERAL THEORY OF ACTION, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1951.

Wilson, Logan: THE ACADEMIC MAN, Oxford University Press, New York, 1942.

Znaniecki, Florian: THE SOCIAL ROLE OF THE MAN OF KNOWLEDGE, Columbia University Press, New York, 1940.

Donald S. Dushkind works at the New York State Training School for Boys.

BOOK REVIEWS

Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Edited by Dorwin Cart-
wright and Alvin Zander. White Plains, New York: Row,
Peterson and Company, 1953.

Group Dynamics is an endeavor to understand the bases of group
life. The method is empirical. Although many of these empirical
studies have tended almost to completely disregard the theoretical
formulations of group life that were laid down by such early socio-
logists as Cooley and Giddings, the present trend seems to be a join-
ing of forces between the larger body of theory and the testing of
hypotheses that have been "derived" from this theory.

As with any new body of data, it was not unexpected that differ-
ences in conceptualization would arise. The basic worth of the pres-
ent volume is that it brings all this "chaos" together, mixes it well,
adds a few choice ingredients, and comes out with an amazingly
integrated product. The "chaos" constitutes a selection representing
fifty-one contributors who are primarily rooted in social and experi-
mental psychology, but whose inquiries spill over and receive socio-
logical and anthropological refinement at many points.

The six parts that comprise the contents are as follows: (1) Ap-
proaches to the Study of Groups, (2) Group Cohesiveness, (3)
Group Pressures and Group Standards, (4) Group Goals and Group
Locomotion, (5) The Structural Properties of Groups, and (6)
Leadership. The findings pertain to group patterns and group
functions almost everywhere in society, thus making the volume
an enviable source-book that spares the reader the necessity for
having to probe through a raft of journals and monographs in
order to keep up-to-date (Is there such a thing?) in the field.
The individual investigations within these six sections represent
an orderly array of subject matter. "Well-mixed" indeed.

But the secret lies in the "choice ingredients" that are added. This
is represented by the introductory remarks of the editors to *each*
section. These remarks constitute six full chapters that not only
serve to integrate the many and varied researches in a most adequate
manner, but more important, these explanatory presentations serve
as *significant systematic background* to the whole field of group
dynamics.

To this reviewer, Part V (The Structural Properties of Groups),
is especially meritorious. Beginning with the introduction by the
editors, and through the individual researches of especially Mills,

Kelley, Lippitt *et al.*, and particularly the Hurwitz, Zander and Hymovitch article, "Some Effects of Power on the Relations Among Group Members," there is all solid meat *and* potatoes. The concept of power is experimentally manipulated in these researches, and all are a welcome prelude to further investigations that must inevitably open up this heretofore "untouchable" area of behavior dynamics.

Sociologist Lundberg, in his little classic *Can Science Save Us?* has taken the unalterable position that "the best hope for man in his present social predicament lies in a type of social science strictly comparable to the other natural sciences." He continues, "Actually, of course, only time and future scientific development can finally demonstrate the validity of (this) position . . . "

The editorial product and the personal contributions of Cartwright and Zander are definitely a solid rung in Lundberg's hoped-for ladder of accomplishment. One further hopes that some thought might be given to an annual coverage of this field of scholarship, and that the present editors might continue in the same capacity for years to come.

One final comment. This reviewer feels that the subtitle would be more adequately stated as *Research and Theory in Human Relations*.

<div align="right">Theodore I. Lenn</div>

WHO KILLED KENYA? By Colin Wells. 111 pages With illustrations. London. Dennis Dobson Limited, 1953.

Mau Mau. By C. T. Stoneham. 156 pages. London: Museum Press Limited, 1953.

Two Englishmen, this year, have written books which reflect their knowledge of much of the culture of the African, tribes living in the Province of Kenya: Colin Wells, in his *WHO KILLED KENYA?*, wrote with understanding and compassion, while C. T. Stoneham, in his *Mau Mau,* wrote with anger and antagonism. Both attempt to explain why the Mau Mau secret society was able to spread its terror throughout Kenya.

Early in his book, Wells says " . . . one thing I am sure of is that the assumption that primitives are inferior as human beings to dwellers in more highly developed societies, is based not on science but on ignorance" . . . He does not believe that Kenya should

belong to either the European or the African alone, but that it should be shared by the European, African and Indian working co-operatively. He points out that the Africans of Kenya are not yet ready for the program of self-government operating among the West Africans, and describes their past and present culture to prove this. Although he disagrees with the contention made by some Europeans that the African is a savage at heart, and that his acceptance of civil-ized values is superficial, he does hold that the Africans in Kenya are not so far removed from the days when savage warfare and superstitious ritual dominated their lives. In fact, it is because so many Kikuyu living today can remember those days, that they have fallen victims to Mau Mau propaganda and tactics. He feels that many of those who have taken the oath of loyalty to this society have been forced by fear to do so. He praises the fine leaders of the Kikuyu people, who are most influenced by the Mau Mau, for try-ing to lead their people back to a stage of cooperation with the Euro-peans, and cites their success at persuading masses of Kikuyu to be cleansed by their witch doctors and absolved from their oaths to the Mau Mau.

He does not oppose the pure nationalist movement, which he says originated "in the natural desire of active, forward-looking leaders to achieve the best possible future for their people". He believes that if all the intelligent educated young Africans could get jobs merited by their accomplishments at the same pay received by Europeans for the same work, and if they could live within a social pattern of mutual respect, they would be "less likely to dream destructive dreams".

Wells cites the great importance of land to the Kikuyu people of Kenya, and the fact that there is not enough farm and grazing land available to them now, so that their young men are forced to go to the towns and cities where they have become de-tribalized, and have so often fallen into evil ways. However, he glides over rather casually the fact that many Africans are confined to the "native reserves" while the Europeans farm the choice uplands.

Never-the-less, in spite of the violence of the Mau-Maus, and the selfishness, as he sees it, of the Europeans and Africans; in spite of the fact that the British people at home do not follow as closely as they might the peoples living in remote countries under the same government as they, and the fact that the British administrators in Africa are not as close to the Africans in their personal contacts as they once were; in spite of the irresponsibility of some Europeans and Africans, Wells says that perhaps the men of good will of both

groups will have their chance to build a new Kenya. One of the definite reasons for his hopeful attitude is the support being given by Europeans and Africans to the "Common Roll Policy", a political plan which provides that citizens of all races have the franchise on a common electoral roll, but with such safeguards as basic educational qualifications.

This book is easy to read, interspersed with several good illustrations, and on the whole objective in its presentation of tense and explosive human relations.

C. T. Stoneham, in *Mau Mau,* gives one account after another of violent death and bloody terror, accompanied by a few gruesome photographs, taken from police records and newspaper files in Kenya. He understand many of the ramifications of the African secret societies, and to him there can be no equivocation, "no palliative excuses about provocation or economic justice:" the Mau-Maus are either right or wrong. He has no respect for the "African native", who, he says, is by instinct and cultivation a liar. When he discusses individual tribes, he speaks in generalities: the Kikuyu are treacherous and favor the powerful in every dispute; the Suks are savage and unpredictable; the Somali, ferocious; the Masai, predaceous, etc. He says that in general the African is " . . . slow, careless and inefficient . . . cannot be taught . . . (and) . . . Added to these advantages of stupidity and carelessness, pilfering has become a universal practice among them".

Like Wells, he, too, points out that " . . . famine, smallpox and the predatory attentions of their neighbors" were removed with the coming of the European to Kenya, and "the black man was flourishing (before the Mau Mau) as never before in all the thousands of years of his unrecorded history". He writes of the Kikuyu people as immigrants to Kenya from another part of Africa, and decries the claims of the educated African nationalists to the land of Kenya. He points out that the anxiety of the Kikuyu leaders in the matter of land tenure is needless, for under the Native Lands & Trust Ordinance, native lands are to be held in trust for the native peoples "for ever". He explains that the white farmers lent the land to the Kikuyu to live on while they worked on the large farms, and says that the Africans" . . . soon became so much at home that it seemed they had unalienable rights of tenure". However, he scoffs at the suggestion made by British journals to adjust the political and social situation in African as an answer to the present problem of the conflict between the Europeans and Africans. He considers the attitude of the British Government as too easy and considerate of "the

black man's belongings as sacrosanct". He shows his bitterness against the Kikuyu leaders in his pity for the "poor Suks", who had no "tweed-coated students, with collars and ties and smiling black faces to plead their cause in the drawing rooms of London and arouse the sympathy of the friends of the Africans."

He describes the native communities as breeding places of thieves and prostitutes, and attributes the growth of the Mau Mau among the Kikuyus to their love of witchcraft and fanaticism and their loyalty to tribal oaths. However, he cites the fact that the Kikuyu people are not the only Africans advocating the casting out of the Europeans so that Africans "may reign supreme in their own land"; the Suks, the Kitosh and Nandi tribes also carried on a campaign of burning property in order to make Africa "too hot for the European."

Undoubtedly, the author knows much about the workings and influence of secret societies among the peoples of East Africa. (He not only describes the operation of the Mau-Maus, but also gives detailed accounts of other groups as the Dini ya Jesu Kristo and the Dini ya Masambwa, both terroristic societies.) It is deplorable that a man knowing so much about the Africans should color his book with his own personal prejudices against a people whom he holds in contempt and disdain. Due to the fact that his book was written from day to day while events were still happening, it is a rather disjointed, contradictory, emotional account of horror and hatred involving a tribe whose lives have been "disrupted by despeate fanatical criminals". To this author, the people about whom he writes are strange, unreliable and inferior, and to understand their view of life is "a life-time study, but in the end it results in bafflement, for no one can divine (the African's) mental processes".

William H. Grayson, Jr.